of new districts would certainly not be sufficient to warrant annual sessions. He had not risen to take up the time of the Convention in unnecessary debate, and he would detain it no longer. If these were the strongest arguments which could be brought forward by the friends of the annual system, he would still adhere to biennial sessions, believing that they are in accordance with the will of the people.

The question was then stated to be on the motion of Mr. Spencer, to strike out the fifth and sixth sections, and insert the amendments he had offered.

Mr. Biser called for a division—first on striking out;

Which was ordered.

And the question being taken,

The motion to strike out was rejected.

Mr. Jacobs now moved to reconsider the vote, adopting the third section.

The vote having been reconsidered.

Mr. Jacobs said, his object in the amendment he had offered to the third section, was to make the State elections conform to the Presidential election. Finding he had been mistaken in the day—he now moved to strike out the first Monday in November, and insert "on the Tuesday next after the first Monday, in the month of November."

Mr. Spencer called for a division on striking

Which was ordered.

The motion to strike out was agreed to.

The question then recurred on the motion to insert the day designated by Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Brown moved a reconsideration, of the vote striking out from the third section the words, "first Monday in November."

He made the motion, he said, because he had given his vote in favor of the motion to strike out under a misapprehension. The object he had in view, was to keep the State and the general elections free from each other.

Some conversation followed on the part of Messrs. Brown, Thomas, Dirickson and Mitchell.

Mr. Spencer asked the year and nays, on the motion to reconsider;

Which were ordered; and

Being taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Buchanan, Welch, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, McLane, Spencer, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Ware, Harbine, Brewer, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower and Brown.—34.

Megative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Dalrymple, Sollers, John Dennis, Hicks, Hodson, Phelps, Sprigg, Bowling, Dirickson, Hearn, Ja-

cobs, Magraw, Schley, Fiery, Neill, Waters Smith and Cockey-28.

So the vote was reconsidered.

The question now recurred on striking out the "first Monday in November," and inserting the amendment of Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Chambers, of Kent, suggested to the gentleman from Worcester, that it was not worth while to press this question now. There was but a thin attendance, and that it would be impossible to determine to-day, what the sense of the Convention was.

Mr. Jacobs explained that his only object was, in the amendment he had offered, to avoid the multiplicity of elections.

But the sense of the Convention had been expressed, as he supposed, that the State and Federal elections should be held on the same day. He was not anxious to press the question now—and yielding to the suggestions of gentlemen, would withdraw the amendment for the present.

Mr. Dirickson gave notice that he should tomorrow move to reconsider the vote of the Convention on the second section of the report.

The fifth section was then again read.

Mr. Thomas moved to amend the section after the word "every" in the second line, by inserting the word "second."

The question was taken.

But no quorum voted.

Mr. Magraw moved that the third, fifth and sixth sections of the report, be passed over informally.

The President. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Objection was made.

Some conversation followed on the part of Messrs. Chambers, of Kent, Thomas, and Harbine.

Mr. Spences proposed to amend the section by inserting, in the second line the words "and on the same day in the year 1853."

The question was stated to be on the amendment of Mr. Spencer.

Mr. Spencer asked the yeas and nays;

Which were ordered.

Some desultory conversation followed, as to the effect of the amendment, in which Messrs. Spencer, Thomas, Constable, Wells, Phelps, Buchanan, Harbine and Donaldson, took part.

The question on the amendment of Mr. Spencer was then taken and resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Sellman, Buchanan, Welch, Sherwood of Talbot, John Dennis, Hicks, Hodson, Miller, Sprigg, Bowling, Spencer, George, Wright, Dirickson, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Biser, Annan, Carter, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Fiery, Neill, Harbine, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Smith and Cockey—

Negative—Messrs. Lloyd, Dickinson, Phelps, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, McLane, Hearn,